

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
JACKSON DIVISION**

MONDRIC F. BRADLEY

PETITIONER

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:05CV238LN

**THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
and JIM HOOD**

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

This matter came before the court on several motions filed by the Petitioner that have been reviewed by the court, and on which the court is now prepared to rule.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED as follows:

1. Motion for Default Judgment (filed April 12, 2006), Motion of Objection of Relief by Summary Judgment (filed April 12, 2006), Pro Se Self Styled Motion of Objections (filed April 13, 2006), Pro Se Self Styled Motion of Objections (filed May 4, 2006), Pro Se Self Styled Hand Drawn Motion to Clarify (filed June 2, 2006) - All of these Motions relate to the court's extending the time for the Respondents to answer the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. The court has ruled on similar motions before and has informed the Petitioner that it will not reconsider the granting of an extension to the Respondents. The court ultimately granted the Respondents until May 31, 2006, to answer the Petition, and the Respondents timely submitted their response. Therefore, these Motions will also be considered as Motions for Reconsideration and are hereby **denied**.
2. Pro Se Pre Hand Drawn Self Styled Motion to Amend under Fed. R. And Civ. P. 15 and 19(a), Pro Se Self Styled Pre Hand Drawn Motion for the Designation of Records

Pursuant to MSCOA Rule 10(B)(1); Request for the Designation of Records and Transcript Pursuant to MSCOA Rule 10(B)(1) - These Motions relate to Mr. Bradley's apparent belief that this matter is connected to an appeal that he wishes to take in state court. The District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi is a federal court that is in a completely different court system than the Mississippi Supreme Court or the Mississippi Court of Appeals, both of which are state courts. The proceeding pending in this court is a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, and is not an appeal, nor does it relate in any way to any state court proceedings. Therefore, these Motions are hereby **denied**.

3. Pro Se Motion for Additional Time - This Motion seeks additional time within which to respond to the Answer and Motion to Dismiss filed by the Respondents in this matter. Mr. Bradley does not specify how much additional time he needs; however, in light of his obvious difficulty in understanding these proceedings, the court is willing to grant him a generous extension of time to formulate a response. Therefore, this motion is hereby **granted**, and the Petitioner may have until September 29, 2006, within which to submit a response to the Respondents' Answer and Motion to Dismiss.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this the 27th day of July, 2006.

S/James C. Sumner
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE